

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Natarajan et al.	Art Unit :	1762
Serial No. :	10/676,434	Examiner :	James Lin
Filed :	September 30, 2003	Conf. No. :	7054
Title :	SOLVENT MIXTURES FOR AN ORGANIC ELECTRONIC DEVICE		

**Mail Stop RCE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

The applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview of May 9, 2007, with the applicant's representative, Jennifer Zanolocco. The Office Action of February 7, 2007, and the use of the terms "first solvent" and "second solvent" with respect to the claims and the reference were discussed.

In addition to the comments submitted in the previous response, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly used hindsight to find that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have used 20 weight percent of xylene, i.e., a third solvent having a surface tension less than 30 dynes/cm, with a reasonable expectation of success. Further, the Examiner applied similar reasoning to claim 51, which requires that the third solvent is less than about ten weight percent of the solution. The Examiner argued that "[t]o have used 10 weight percent of xylene and 30 weight percent of the other solvent would have been an obvious modification." And "obvious modification" is not the standard for supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Examiner appears to find that any modification of the reference in terms of amounts of the components of the solution would be an obvious modification sufficient to support an obviousness rejection.

Applicant notes that MPEP § 2142 states, "impermissible hindsight must be avoided and the legal conclusion must be reached on the basis of the facts gleaned from the prior art." The applicant reminds the Examiner that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that there is suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, that there is a reasonable expectation of

success and that the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (see MPEP § 2142).


Along with this interview summary and comments, the applicant submits a Request for Continued Examination. Applicant respectfully requests further examination in light of these comments and the pending claims.

Please apply any required charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 6, 2007



Jennifer A. Zanicco  
Reg. No. 54,563

Customer No. 26181  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071